



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

one cares to fall in with, even in a book. Yet the Clytemnestra of Æschylus is possessed of more and worse devils than Lady Macbeth. The former is as much beyond the latter in iniquity as the billiard-table is beyond the checker-board in gambling. Shakspere's mind could not easily have brought itself down to the task of giving birth to a conception so utterly black and unrelieved as that of Æschylus' Clytemnestra. She has not even the excuse of a blind mad ambition to extenuate her crimes. In depicting either of them, Homer could have found little of pleasure or willing inspiration. His harp would have shuddered in his grasp, and gone out of tune.

An exception to the ordinary character of the Homeric women should also be made in speaking of that bellicose and strong-tempered class, to whom the poet affixes the epithet, "man-hating;" who preferred that the general's wife should be the general. In place of vexing the public ear with melancholy recitals about their crushed condition, these man-haters made a concerted strike for higher honors and took them by storm. Not quite satisfied with physical endowments which they had received from nature, they are said to have burnt off the right breast, that they might wield the bow with greater skill and freedom. The Amazons certainly fortified their ascendancy in a cautious and business-like way. It may be charged that they took an unfair advantage of their maternal opportunities. Fearing that they might be worsted in an open contest with full-grown men, they carefully reared their female offspring, while the males were either murdered or mutilated.

Of course this is mere fable. Yet some may be so ungallant as to insist that the moral of a fable is of more account than the fable itself.

On the whole, it must be claimed that Homer understood the sphere and the mission of woman quite as well as it is understood by certain recent reformers, who would inaugurate a more ostentatious era in her history. In journeying through a wilderness of dactyls and spondees more than twenty-five centuries old, all such baggage as modern bloomeryism and declarations of female independence, must be taken at the risk of the owner.

It must also be claimed that Homer magnified his epic office, and brought lustre to his name, by his chivalrous de-

fence and illustration of the true womanhood. Every man who is himself great, will recognize a greatness in woman. Napoleon recognized it by banishing from Paris the authoress of *Corinne*; Homer, by enthroning Arete, the wife of King Alcinous, in the hearts of her subjects. Napoleon's act was brutal and cowardly; Homer's was worthy of himself.

PERSPECTIVE AS A STUDY.

By Adolph Le Veageur.

 ET those who deem these lines worthy of attention, rest assured that nobody can possess more experience than myself, of the number of scruples and difficulties that have to be overcome in enticing some pupils to study Perspective, especially when it is taught in that irrational, planless manner, which I must with sorrow confess, is generally adopted. Too many mathematical subtleties, linear conflicts, alarm beginners (especially those of the fairer sex), and fill them with a natural aversion, which deters them from penetrating through the shell to the sound and healthy kernel. An excessive number of books have been written, and are continually appearing, with the avowed object of naturalizing Perspective, but the result attained is entirely contrary to that intended. For example, it is repelling to the beginner (it is perfectly ridiculous to the artist), if he sees that simply to draw a chair, box, etc., he has to penetrate such an enormous web of lines before he can with difficulty observe the required object itself.

It is only a few weeks ago that I had a newly published book of that kind sent to me for perusal. I waded through it with great patience, but the only satisfaction which I have for my lost time is, that, at least to my friends, this loss of precious time will once for all be saved. This may sound hard language, but no critique can be too severe in this respect, in order to combat effectively this thoughtless fashion of needlessly perplexing the learner. Many a shot will yet have to be fired to effect the eradication of this nuisance, as well as other quackeries. Perspective—the art of seeing aright—must not be thought separately, but in union with the observation of Nature. The instructor must possess sufficient tact to be

able to keep clear of everything too strikingly mathematical, and to reduce the whole to simple principles. It will even be a very good method, at first, not to let the beginner know that he has the so-much-feared Perspective before him. By such a method, he will at length arrive at the conclusion that what is current under the name of Perspective is, in fact, nothing but a most requisite accessory in Art, namely, the power of seeing accurately. Let us take two beginners, both of *absolutely equal capacity*; the one resolutely applies himself to the acquirement of this necessary auxiliary—Perspective, while the other, without ceremony, attempts to draw from Nature. The latter will only, after a considerable loss of precious time, if ever, be able to reproduce Nature with truth and feeling on the canvas—a pleasing result, no doubt—which, however, with moderate zeal, the former attains in a comparatively short period, and that with certainty. This is my decided conviction, based on, and supported by experience. I am perfectly aware that, by recommending the study of Perspective, founded on the contemplation of Nature, as an indispensable preparatory auxiliary discipline, no thinking man (and for the opinion of others I do not care) will accuse me of depreciating other studies out of regard for Perspective. Fully convinced of the truth that—

Where Fashion throws her chain
True Art can ne'er remain,

I, nevertheless, recommend Perspective from the first, as a necessary, sure, and faithful guide for every student of Art. Indeed, it would be well if such teachers as have hitherto regarded this study as secondary, pretending that it is not necessary (if they spoke the truth they would confess, "*Nemo dat, qui non habet!*") would follow me. As the diamond can only be polished by the diamond, so the artist is only refined by the artist, and therefore, as a true and sincere fellow-worker and friend, I would, as the result of my own studies, recommend to certain young painters, earnestly and attentively to cultivate Perspective simultaneously with their other studies, particularly if it has been neglected in former years. I desire them to reflect, that returning to a former position will be an advance, when the last step has been a retreat. The foundation of all real improvement is the recognition of an evil.

* * * * *